Mr. Charlie Peters, editor
The Washington Monthly
1611 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20009

12/11/94

Dear Mr. Peters,

Because the major media is absolutely corrupt with regard to the assassination of President Kennedy and eschews any responsible writing on it, in April or May I phoned to learn if you would consider an article on the subject. I was told I'd be called as soon as an editor was in. I suppose that no editor appeared for a month or so because I was not called by one. Nonetheless, having no real alternative, my conditions and the sycophancy of the media being what it is, I sent you all I then had, the rough draft of the artgile I'd phoned to ask if it could interest you. With it I sent a long article entitled Senator Russell Dissents. I included a check to cover return postage in the event you decided against the articles. In haste I neglected to date that letter. Then, several months later, I believe, I wrote you again about this on November 6. Still again without response. On December 3 I reminded you again that I had enclosdd a check to cover the return of those manuscripts by Priority Mail. More or less you replied to that on 12/8. In four typed lines. You begin with an apology "for not responding sooner." After a half year that was not a bit premature. You then say there is great interest in the JFK assaassination but it "falls somewhat outside our scope of interest and expertise." To that you add "Best of luck in getting it into print elsewhere." Then, thoughtful man and editor that you are, you are careful not to return the mansucripts so I could do that!

In my letters I explained that I am severely limited in what I am able to do. I may not stand before a xerox machine and we can afford only a simple one that takes a single, hand-fed sheet at a time, and my wife finds it rather much for her. Between us we have accumulated close to 165 years.

Because you have not returned the first of the artgiles, which was the only retyped copy I have, the one who retyped that not having a computer, I no longer have any retyped copy of that. Not that your letter encourages submitting it to any of the so-called independent smaller publications. After all, the assassination of an president being a de facto coup d'etat, it naturally is not "in the scope of interest" of those publications that exist only because they say they fill a void left by the major publications.

As I am certain I wrote you, the state of my health is such that with the subject-matter expertise I have, and I'm sure I told you that the DA says it exceeds that of the FBI, I am using what little time remains to me to try to perfect the record for our history to the degree possible for me. So I do not plan to use any of this time in making any submissions of what I ask you again to please return. With this demonstration from you of what I can expect from those who make your pretensions, there seems to be little point in making any effort.

I do not have to be told what to expect from the major media. I've lived through and on a different level am now living through that. But with your reflection of what I can expect from supposedly courageous editors, who live to publish what the people can get from nowhere else, this your demonstration of concern for the country and its institutions and its freedoms, I believe I need no further demonstrations of the courage and the principle of editors and publishers of the small magazines.

I do not know how old you are. I started writing almost 65 years ago. In all that time I have never even heard of an editor not returning what was sent to him when payment for the cost of the return was sent him.

Aside from which there is nothing in your four typed lines to lead even to the suspicion that you read what I sent you.

Don't tell me the problems of being a small publisher. After getting more that 100 rejections for the basic book on what turned the country and the world around, without a single adverse editorial comment, although broke and in debt I became a publisher to open that subject up. (And after almost 30 years I continue to get high ~~prias~~ praise for it, as recently as in the mail with your letter.) I know the problems as I hope you have not had to learn them.

And at past 81 and in poor and impaired health every letter we get gets an answer. I've heard from more than 20,000 sttangers, too, over the years.

I'm sorry that I have to take the time to write you still again for the return of what I paid you in advance to return, but addressing the envelope that is free from the post office department ought not take that much time from your busy days.

Harold Weisberg 12/10/94

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702